

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted simultaneously with filing of a Request for Continuing Examination.

In the Final Action the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite.

Also, the claims are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentably under the U.S. patent to Shafer in view of the U.S. patents to Maesoba and Oohashi.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for rejection of the claims, applicants amended the claims in formal aspects, and it is therefore believed that the Examiner's grounds for rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112 should be considered as not tenable and should be withdrawn.

Applicants also amended the claims to more clearly define the present invention and to distinguish it from the prior art.

Before the analysis of the prior art it is believed to be advisable to explain the new features of the present invention as defined in Claims 1 and 13, the broadest independent claims.

In the method proposed for manufacturing multiphase windings of an electric machine the cross sections of the wire elements of the elongated wire elements (7, 11, 12) is deformed by stamping a cross-sectional profile (13) to increase a slot space factor.

In accordance with the present invention three types of the stamped wire elements are loaded in offsetting dies, in particular the stamped wire element (7) which are U-shaped and to be provided with two legs and a rounded part – to constitute the windings (32), the stamped wire elements (11) which have bent ends at an angle of substantially 90° - to constitute an integrated star point (21), and the stamped wire elements (12) provided with an offset – for supply current to the windings (32). A winding head (20) with an integrated star point (21) is formed with the use of the offsetting dies so that the legs of the U-shaped stamped wire elements (7) are offset by rotating around an axis, while the bent ends of the stamped wire elements (11) face one another, and the stamped wire elements (12) are located on the outside opposite to the wire elements (11). When the bend radial, inward-oriented ends of the stamped wire

elements (11) are connected with a connecting ring (40) which is disposed radially inward on an inside (41) of the finished winding head (20).

None of the references discloses a method with the use of the above-mentioned three different types of the stamped wire elements, with their particular deformation, and relative arrangement.

These particular features, with their interaction and interjunction, are not disclosed in the patents to Shafer, Maesoba, and Oohashi.

The references also do not contain any hint, suggestion or motivation for these features.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that it will not be obvious to arrive at the present invention from the references either taken singly, or in combination with one another.

In order to arrive at the present invention from the teachings of the references, the references have to be fundamentally modified, and in particular by including into them the new features of the present invention which are now defined in amended Claims 1 and 13. However, it is known that in order to arrive at a claimed invention, by modifying the

references the cited art must itself contain a suggestion for such a modification.

This principle has been consistently upheld by the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals which, for example, held in its decision *In Re Randol and Redford* (165 USPQ 586) that:

Prior patents are references only for what they clearly disclose or suggest, it is not a proper use of a patent as a reference to modify its structure to one which prior art references do not suggest.

In view of the above-presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 13 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on Claim 1, they share its allowable features, and therefore they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in

formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael J. Striker', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233